



AF/3683

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 10/010,203 Confirmation No. 6290
Appellant : Goldino Sousa Alves
Filed : November 30, 2001
TC/A.U. : 3683
Examiner : Bradley T. King

Docket No. : 01-603
Customer No. : 34704

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

RECEIVED
NOV 23 2004
GROUP 3600

REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

This is in reply to the Examiner's Answer dated September 16, 2004.

REMARKS

In the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the Examiner's Answer dated September 16, 2004, the Examiner contends that the language of claim 2 fails to define the isolator in a manner which would preclude the interpretation taken by the Examiner. Such a contention is wrong. Claim 2 is clear that the system includes at least one vibration isolator with "each vibration isolator having a plurality of layers with at least one layer being a hard layer and at least one layer being a soft layer." Element 13 is a vertically disposed shoe and element 17 is a gib. The specification does not disclose that either of these elements performs any function as a vibration isolator. The only

element in Mason which has a vibration isolation function is the cushioning member 19, which is a single layer. It is submitted that the Examiner's interpretation of the reference is just that "the Examiner's interpretation". It is not anything which the reference teaches or suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. For this reason, Mason does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 2.

With regard to the Examiner's comments on pages 5 and 6 of the Answer, the only element described in the Japanese reference that has any purpose as a vibration isolator is the rubber 22. None of the other elements relied upon by the Examiner are indicated in the reference as having any vibration isolation function. This is clear from the full text translation provided by the Examiner for the first time with his Answer. The element 21 which the Examiner says is part of the vibration isolator is in actuality an L-shaped bracket which is secured to the guide shoe frame 20. Element 23 is nothing more than a support plate with a stud bolt 24 which is vulcanization bonded to an end of the anti-vibration rubber. Element 27 is an L-shaped bracket which is connected to the anti-vibration 11 via bolt 24 and plate 23. No anti-vibration function is assigned to any of the elements 21, 23, and 27. Claim 2 is allowable because the cited and applied reference does not teach the structure of the claimed vibration isolator.

Claim 10 is allowable because the cited and applied Japanese reference does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter of a plurality of hard layers and soft layers.

Claims 11 - 14 are allowable for the reasons set forth in Appellant's Brief.

For the foregoing reasons and the reasons set forth in Appellant's Brief, the instant application is believed to be allowable. The Board is hereby requested to reverse the rejections of record and remand the case to the Examiner for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Goldino Sousa Alves

By 

Barry L. Kelmachter
BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.
Reg. No. 29,999
Attorney for Appellant

Telephone: (203)777-6628 ext. 112

Telefax: (203)865-0297

Email: docket@bachlap.com

IN TRIPLICATE

Date: November 16, 2004

I, Nicole Motzer, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313" on November 16, 2004.

